

Appl. No. 10/064,212
Amdt. dated December 17, 2004
Reply to Office action of September 24, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Please amend the specification as identified in the "Amendments to the Specification" section of this response. No new material has been introduced.

5

Examiner:

Claims 2-5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10

Response:

The Applicant acknowledges and appreciates the allowance of claims 2-5 if rewritten appropriately.

15 Examiner:

Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rayskiy (US 6,278,387 B1) in view of Lerner et al. (US 6,169,802 B1) Claims 7, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rayskiy (US 6,278,387 B1) [and] Lerner et al. (US 6,169,802 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Wang (US 2002/0133764 A1).

20

Response:

Concerning claim 1, it is not clear exactly what the Examiner means when

Appl. No. 10/064,212
Amdt. dated December 17, 2004
Reply to Office action of September 24, 2004

5 suggesting that Rayskiy and Lerner et al. anticipate the present invention. As only one example of a difference, the present application's claim 1 limitations include "a parameter" that indicates whether error checking is to be performed. When the parameter indicates that error checking is to be used, frames having invalid checksums are stored for later reference without decoding. This not only reduces processing time but also recognizes that otherwise perfectly good media files may contain one or more corrupted frames (Paragraph [0021]). When the parameter indicates that error checking is no longer to be used, frames are decoded and output without the benefit of error protection (Paragraph [0012]), providing the advantage of a capability of playing a media file generated by an incompatible encoder. The use of the parameter gives the present invention the advantage of being able to play a media file generated by any encoder while providing checksum protection whenever possible (Paragraph [0013]). The Applicant is unable to find any teachings in the cited prior art teaching such a parameter. Instead, Fig.6 of Lerner et al. clearly illustrates that a checksum is always used to verify a received message. If a check sum is always used, there is neither apparent reason nor teaching in Lerner et al. of having the parameter in question. For at least this reason, the Applicant believes that claims 1, 6, 7, and 8 represent methodology not suggested by known prior art and respectfully requests reconsideration of claims 1 and 6-8.

25 Independent claim 9 has been amended to include the limitation of "wherein a first predefined constant is used as a destructive factor in calculations determining whether or not to continue using the error check field to verify the integrity of the data within the frame". This is similar to the limitation found in claim 2, which the Examiner has said that prior arts of record "do not anticipate nor render obvious". No new material has been introduced. Therefore, the Applicant believes that claim 9 as amended should be allowable and respectfully requests reconsideration of claim 9

Appl. No. 10/064,212
Amdt. dated December 17, 2004
Reply to Office action of September 24, 2004


and claims 10-11 dependant thereon.

Additionally, please amend the present application to include new claims 12-16.

5 Claim 12 depends upon claim 9 and is supported by claim 3. Independent claim 13 and
claims 13-15 dependent thereon is supported by Fig.2 and Paragraphs [0011] and [0012].
Among other things, these claims comprise the "parameter" and "first predefined
constant" believed to be distinct from known prior art. Claim 16 is supported by
Paragraph [0018]. No new material has been introduced. The Applicant respectfully
10 requests consideration and allowance of claims 12-16.

Sincerely yours,

15



Date: December 17, 2004

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

20 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

(Please contact me by voice mail if you need a telephone communication.)

25